

REMARKS

The Examiner is requiring restriction to one of the following groups:

Group I: Claims 1-8, 14, 15, 21, 22, 28 and 29, drawn to a method for connecting a plastic pipe to another plastic part; and

Group II: Claims 9-13, 16-20, 23-27 and 30-34, drawn to composite parts.

Applicants have elected Group II, claims 9-13, 16-20, 23-27 and 30-34, with traverse.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the examiner if restriction is not required (M.P.E.P. § 803). The burden of proof is on the Examiner to provide reasons and/or examples, to support any conclusion in regard to patentable distinctness (M.P.E.P. § 803). Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Examiner has not carried the burden of providing sufficient reason and/or examples to support any conclusion that the claims of the restricted groups are patentably distinct.

The Examiner has categorized the relationships between Groups I and II as process of making and product made, as previously categorized in the Requirement for Restriction mailed May 10, 2005. Patentable distinctness may be shown if either or both of the following can be shown: (A) that the process as claimed is not an obvious process of making the product and the process as claimed can be used to make other and different products; or (B) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f)). The Examiner asserts that the claimed product can be made by a process such as by casting.

As previously asserted in the Response dated June, 10, 2005, Applicants submit that the does not meet the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f), because the Examiner has not shown or provided any evidence that the claimed article can be made by casting. In particular, the Examiner has not shown how a "composite part produced by the method of


Application No. 10/670,528
Reply to Office Action of July 20, 2005

claim 1," as explicitly recited in claim 9, can be produced simply by "casting." As such, the Examiner's reasoning is merely a restatement of the Examiner's conclusion that the two groups are patentably distinct. Therefore, the Examiner has not met the required burden.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Bryant L. Young
Registration No. 49,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)